



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,177	11/16/2001	John Saare	03226.440001;P6490	8469
32615	7590	11/18/2005		
OSHA LIANG L.L.P./SUN 1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800 HOUSTON, TX 77010				
EXAMINER TRUONG, LAN DAI T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2143				

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/015,177	SAARE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	lan dai thi trung	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim rejections-35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

1) Claims 1-3, 5-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rouse et al. (U.S. 20020087628), “Rouse”, herein after.

Regarding to claims 1, 7 and 12:

Rouse discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including a method, apparatus and system, which can be implemented in a computer hardware or software code for providing extensible client mail functions using a distributed computer network, comprising:

- a) Receiving a request for mail functions from a client: (Rouse discloses an access server-base information can be accessed from a user’s mobile device such as mobile phone, interactive pager...etc. for email services: abstract, lines 1-12)
- b) Accessing a Java server page corresponding to the request: (Rouse discloses a page generator generates requested page from the user: figure 2; page 4, left column, lines 1-30)
- c) Accessing a plurality of tags contained within the Java server page: (Rouse discloses the user can view, search, forward messages to other recipients...page 1, right column, lines 30-36)

d) Processing the Java server page using the tags to access a mail server for providing the mail functions: (page 1, right column, lines 30-54)

e) Transmitting the processed Java server page to the client: (the user may access directly to mail server for email services such as viewing “a personal mail inbox, and mail message” those are equivalent to “java server pages”: page 2, left column, lines 52-55)

Regarding to claims 2 and 13:

Rouse discloses a method as discuss in claims 1 and 12, which further includes accessing the Java server page corresponding to the request, wherein the Java server page is retrieved from a set of compiled Java server page classes: (Rouse discloses the user receives email after sending out a request to the server: page 2, left column, lines 52-55)

Regarding to claim 8:

Rouse discloses a method as discuss in claim 7, which further includes wherein the new Java server page includes HTML content and the tags from b), c), and d): (Rouse discloses the email application may enable users to view messages in various “presentation view” which is equivalent to “HTML page” wherein contains “action menu” which is equivalent to “the tags”: abstract, lines 9-12; figure 5, item 512)

Regarding to claims 9:

Rouse discloses a method as discuss in claim 8, which further includes wherein the tags are configured to provide dynamic content for the Java server page: (Rouse discloses method of clicking different function tag will retrieve different pages: figure 6)

Regarding to claim 10:

Rouse discloses a method as discuss in claims 8, which further includes customizing the new Java server page by customizing the tags: (the users can also customize the information the is received and send from the mobile device: page 2, right column, lines 5-17)

Regarding to claims 3-4 and 11, 14-15:

Rouse discloses a method as discuss in claims 1, 7 and which further includes wherein the tags contained within the Java server page are configured to provide access to mail functions provided by the mail server: (the user can access different email functions by selecting desired options from the mail menu: figure 5, item 600)

Regarding to claims 5 and 16:

Rouse discloses a method as discuss in claims 1 and 12, which further includes transmitting the processed Java server page to the client in accordance with WAP (wireless application protocol) communication standards: (Rouse discloses the communication between user device and server is wireless: abstract, lines 1-12)

Regarding to claims 6 and 17:

Rouse discloses a method as discuss in claims 1 and 12, which further includes transmitting the processed Java server page to the client in accordance with WML (wireless markup language) communication standards: (Rouse discloses text-based browsers may use WML: page 2, right column, lines 54-55)

Claim rejections-35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or descry

bed as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Rouse in view of Kudoh et al. (5,948,058)

Regarding to claims:

Rouse discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 1, but does not explicitly teach providing extended mail functions by accessing a plurality of extended tags contained within the Java server page, wherein the mail functions are extended by adding the extended tags corresponding to new mail functionality of the mail server

However, Kudoh discloses additional tag be added to control unit, see (Kudoh: column 16, lines 20-36)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kudoh's ideas of adding more tag to control unit with Rouse's system in order to provide more mail control options

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to lan dai thi truong whose telephone number is 571-272-7959. The examiner can normally be reached on monday- friday from 8:30am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2132

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Lan Dai Thi Truong

Examiner

Art Unit 2143

Ldt

11/03/2005



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100